

Comment on “Non-Contextual Hidden Variables and Physical Measurements”*

Adán Cabello[†]

Departamento de Física Aplicada, Universidad de Sevilla, 41012 Sevilla, Spain
(February 1, 2008)

Kent’s conclusion that “non-contextual hidden variable theories cannot be excluded by theoretical arguments of the Kochen-Specker type once the imprecision in real world experiments is taken into account” [Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3755 (1999)], is criticized. The Kochen-Specker theorem just points out that it is impossible even *to conceive* a hidden variable model in which the outcomes of *all* measurements are pre-determined; it does not matter if these measurements are performed or not, or even if these measurements can be achieved only with finite precision.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Bz, 03.67.Hk, 03.67.Lx

In a recent Letter [1], Kent generalizes a result advanced by Meyer [2], and concludes that: (i) “Non-contextual hidden variable [NCHV] theories cannot be excluded by theoretical arguments of the K[ochen]-S[pecker] type [3–5] once the imprecision in real world experiments is taken into account”. (ii) “This does not (...) affect the situation regarding local hidden variable [LHV] theories, which can be refuted by experiment, modulo reasonable assumptions [6–8].”

In my view, the situation is the opposite: The KS theorem holds, precisely because it is a theoretical argument which deals with *gedanken* concepts such as ideal yes-no questions. However, the empirical refutation of LHV theories can be questioned precisely on the grounds of the inevitable finiteness of the precision of real measurements. Allow me to illustrate both points.

The KS theorem is a mathematical statement which asserts that for a physical system described in quantum mechanics (QM) by a Hilbert space of dimension greater than or equal to three, it is possible to find a set of n projection operators, which represent yes-no questions about an individual physical system, so that none of the 2^n possible sets of “yes” or “no” answers is compatible with the sum rule of QM for orthogonal resolutions of the identity (i.e., if the sum of a subset of mutually orthogonal projection operators is the identity, one and only one of the corresponding answers ought to be “yes”) [9]. The smallest example currently known of such a set has only 18 yes-no questions (about a physical system described by a four-dimensional Hilbert space) [10]. As far as I can see,

the plain new result contained in [1] is the following: For any physical system described by a finite Hilbert space, it is always possible to construct a set of projection operators, which is *dense* in the set of all projection operators, so that an assignation of “yes” or “no” answers is possible in a way compatible with the sum rule of QM. From a mathematical point of view, it is clear that this new result does not, by no means, nullify the KS theorem. However, Kent affirms that this is so when one takes into account that realistic physical measurements are always of finite precision. Kent seems to assume that the KS theorem concerns the results of a (counterfactual) set of measurements, instead of (the plain non-existence of) a set of yes-no questions with pre-determined answers. The KS theorem just points out that it is impossible even *to conceive* a hidden variable model in which the outcomes of *all* measurements are pre-determined; it does not matter if these measurements are performed or not, or even if these measurements can be achieved only with finite precision. The KS theorem assumes that any NCHV theory is a classical theory, and since in classical physics there is in principle no difficulty to conceive ideal (i.e., defined with infinite precision) yes-no questions, then it is quite legitimate to handle ideal yes-no questions when one is trying to prove that such a theory does not even exist.

The only possible loophole in the KS theorem would be caused by the nonexistence of some of the yes-no questions involved in any of its proofs. However, this loophole would have very weird consequences. For instance, consider a physical system described by a three-dimensional real Hilbert space, and assume that the only yes-no questions with a real existence would be those represented by projection operators defined by vectors with *rational* components. This subset is dense in the set of yes-no questions and admits an assignation of “yes” or “no” answers compatible with the sum rule [2]. However, the initial assumption is in conflict with the superposition principle because some linear combinations of “legal” yes-no questions would be illegal, since their normalization would demand irrational components [11].

On the other hand, the finite precision measurement problem matters in real experiments. It will affect any real experiment based on the KS theorem [12], and indeed affects the theoretical analysis of any real experiment to refute LHV. In fact, real experiments like those of Aspect *et al.* mentioned by Kent, *admit* LHV models [13]. These models still work even assuming perfect efficiency of detectors, but vanish when infinite precision of preparations and (of all required) measurements is assumed.

*Submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.

[†]Electronic address: fite1z1@sis.ucm.es

The author thanks A. Peres and E. Santos for useful comments and clarifications. This work was supported by the Universidad de Sevilla (Grant No. OGICYT-191-97) and the Junta de Andalucía (Grant No. FQM-239).

- [1] A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3755 (1999); Los Alamos e-print archive, quant-ph/9906006.
- [2] D. A. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3751 (1999); Los Alamos e-print archive, quant-ph/9905080.
- [3] E. P. Specker, Dialectica **14**, 239 (1960). English version in *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics. Volume I: Historical Evolution*, edited by C. A. Hooker (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975), p. 135.
- [4] J. S. Bell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38**, 447 (1966).
- [5] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17**, 59 (1967). Reprinted in *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics. Volume I: Historical Evolution*, edited by C. A. Hooker (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975), p. 293.
- [6] J. S. Bell, Physics (Long Island City, N.Y.) **1**, 195 (1964).
- [7] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
- [8] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 460 (1981).
- [9] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993).
- [10] A. Cabello, J. M. Esteban, and G. García Alcaine, Phys. Lett. A **212**, 183 (1996).
- [11] A. Peres, private communication.
- [12] A. Cabello and G. García Alcaine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1797 (1998).
- [13] E. Santos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1388 (1991); Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2702 (1992); Phys. Rev. A **46**, 3646 (1992).